



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

could have seen him going into a dangerous place and prevented the accident. *Straup, C. J., dissenting.*

The general rule is that if the injured person's own negligence contributed to his injury, he cannot recover. *Moulton v. Ry. Co.*, 99 Me. 508; *Jones v. R. R. Co.*, 107 Ala. 400; *Trust Co. v. Fashion Co.*, 106 Ill. App. 135. But the courts differ as to the degree of negligence necessary to bar a recovery. Some courts hold slight negligence on the plaintiff's part sufficient to bar his recovery. *Lindberg v. Ry. Co.*, 83 Ill. App. 433; *Ry. Co. v. Bynum*, 139 Ala. 389. Other courts hold that the plaintiff may recover in spite of slight negligence on his part, when the defendant was grossly negligent. *R. R. Co. v. McElmurry*, 24 Ga. 75. Many courts, by basing their decisions on the doctrine of last clear chance, allow the plaintiff to recover, even where his negligence contributed to the injury, if the defendant, by use of ordinary care, could have prevented the injury. *McLamb v. Ry. Co.*, 122 N. C. 862; *Kolb v. Transit Co.*, 76 S. W. 1050 (Mo.); *Atwood v. Ry. Co.*, 91 Me. 399. The Indiana courts adopt the strict rule that if the plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence he cannot recover unless the defendant was wantonly and willfully negligent. *Ry. Co. v. Ceder*, 110 Ind. 376; *De Lou v. Ry. Co.*, 22 Ind. App. 377. The principle on which the doctrine allows the plaintiff to recover is that his own negligence was the remote cause of the injury. *Troy v. R. R. Co.*, 99 N. C. 298; *Tanner v. Ry. Co.*, 60 Ala. 621. And when the negligence of the plaintiff and the defendant is concurrent, the plaintiff cannot recover. *Butler v. Ry. Co.*, 99 Me. 149; *Power v. Gordon*, 102 Va. 498.

SALES — WARRANTY — STATEMENTS CONSTITUTING. — *WOOLDRIDGE v. BROWN*, 62 S. E. 1076 (N. C.).—The buyer of coal told the salesman that he was buying it to burn brick, and the salesman told him that it would burn brick, and was used for that purpose. *Held*, that the salesman's statement does not show a warranty of quality, or that the grade ordered would burn brick.

No particular form of words is necessary to constitute a warranty. *Hawkins v. Pemberton*, 51 N. Y. 198; and a representation by the seller as to the quality of the article sold is a warranty if so intended by the parties. *Murray v. Smith*, 4 Daly 277; *Weimer v. Clement*, 37 Pa. St. 147. However, a mere statement by the seller of his own belief, upon a matter concerning which the purchaser is to exercise his own judgment, does not constitute a warranty. *Coates v. Harvey*, 10 N. Y. St. 276. But if the buyer relies upon the representation of the seller in making a purchase, he affirmation will be given the effect of a warranty. *Evans v. Schriver Laundry Co.*, 57 Ill. App. 150. A warranty of fitness of an article for a specific purpose cannot be implied from a knowledge on the part of the seller that the article was intended for such purpose. *Bartlett v. Hoppock*, 34 N. Y. 118; *Rose v. Meeks*, 91 Ia. 715.